

2/14/2008 Hearing Transcript

		82emedtctp	
1		UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
1		SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
2		x	
	2	MEDTECH PRODUCTS, INC.,	
3			
J	3	Plaintiff,	
4	J	ramerry,	
-	4	v. 07 Civ. 3302(KMK)(LMS)	
5	-	V. 3302 (Idine)	
3	5		
6	5	RANIR, LLC and CVS PHARMACY, INC.,	
O	6	MANTE, BIE and CVS FINAMACI, INC.,	
7	O	Defendants.	
/	7	x	
0	1		
8	0	MEDTECH PRODUCTS, INC.,	
0	8	Plaintiff,	
9		V.	
10		DENTEK ORAL CARE, INC.,	
11		Defendant.	
	11	x	
12		MEDTECH PRODUCTS, INC.,	
	12	Plaintiff,	
13		v.	
14		POWER PRODUCTS, INC., d/b/a SPLINTEK,	
15		Defendant.	
	15	x	
16			
17			
18		United States Courthouse	
	18	White Plains, N.Y.	
19		February 14, 2008	
	19		
20			
21			
22		Before:	
	22	THE HONORABLE LISA MARGARET SMITH,	
23			
	23	Magistrate Judge	
24	-		
25		*Proceedings recorded via electronic recording device.	

2/14/2008 Hearing Transcript

1 list trade secrets which it considers to be "merely 2 illustrative" on page five. I won't go through them in detail, your Honor, but they all suffer from the same lack of 3 4 specificity and particularity that will jeopardize the scope of 5 relevance in discovery as well as the trade secret claims at issue in this case. 6 7 MR. HELTON: If I could just reply briefly, your 8 Honor. 9 MR. CHENG: Thank you, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Helton, go ahead. 11 MR. HELTON: As Mr. Cheng pointed out, we did identify 12 many paragraphs in our February 8th letter which are taken from 13 the complaint which we filed -- the second amended complaint which we filed in this case and which discuss our trade 14 15 secrets. I have here a two-page list where I just made some 16 notations. And I won't repeat all of the paragraphs, but I 17 will say that we have probably -- we have a second amended complaint that is 68 pages in length. The first 48 pages are 18 19 factual issues. It is in those 48 pages that we describe the trade secrets that we have in this case. And we have done the 20 best that we could, based upon the knowledge that we have, 21 22 without any discovery, to plead the trade secrets that we think are involved, again, without discovery, in this lawsuit. No 23 24 amount of discovery is going to illuminate those provisions of the complaint as far as the motion to dismiss is concerned. 25